

**REDACTED VERSION OF  
DOCUMENT(S) SOUGHT TO BE  
FILED UNDER SEAL**

**EXHIBIT A TO DECLARATION OF  
C. McCORMACK IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE**

1 COOLEY LLP

JOHN C. DWYER (136533) (dwyerjc@cooley.com)

2 PATRICK E. GIBBS (183174) (pgibbs@cooley.com)

SARAH M. LIGHTDALE (4395661) (slightdale@cooley.com)

3 CLAIRE A. MCCORMACK (241806) (cmccormack@cooley.com)

SAMANTHA A. KIRBY (307917) (skirby@cooley.com)

4 3175 Hanover Street

Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130

5 Telephone: (650) 843-5000

Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

6 Attorneys for Defendants

7 NVIDIA CORPORATION, JENSEN

HUANG, COLETTE KRESS, and JEFF FISHER

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10  
11 In re NVIDIA CORPORATION  
12 SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. 4:18-cv-07669-HSG

**DECLARATION OF [REDACTED] IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
STRIKE CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS IN  
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

13  
14 This Document Relates to: All Actions.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 I, [REDACTED] declare as follows:

2 1. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, and if called to  
3 testify, I could and would testify competently thereto.

4 2. I am a former Senior Marketing Manager of Consumer Marketing for NVIDIA  
5 Corporation ("NVIDIA" or the "Company").

6 3. I reviewed the description of "FE 5" in the First Amended Complaint ("FAC")  
7 that was filed in this case on May 13, 2020. After reading the description, I believe that I am the  
8 former NVIDIA employee identified in the FAC as "FE 5." Indeed, paragraph 37 of the FAC  
9 describes FE 5 as: "NVIDIA's Head of Consumer Marketing for South Asia from April 2014 to  
10 June 2019" who was "based in Bengaluru, Karnataka, India." That can only be me. I was  
11 employed by NVIDIA as the Senior Marketing Manager of Consumer Marketing for South Asia  
12 for a little over five years, from April 2014 to June 2019, and was based in Bengaluru,  
13 Karnataka, India. I don't believe that Paragraph 37's description applies to anyone else.

14 4. Some time in approximately March or April of 2020, I had two telephone calls  
15 with a number of people who wanted to ask me some questions about my time working at  
16 NVIDIA. (I will refer to them here as the "Investigators.") When I spoke with the Investigators,  
17 I was in a remote rural location in India, and there was a two- or three-day gap between those  
18 calls. The two calls with the Investigators lasted approximately 45 minutes each and both were  
19 repeatedly disrupted by connection problems.

20 5. I have reviewed the statements that the FAC attributes to FE 5. Several of those  
21 statements are untrue and inaccurate, and I certainly did not make them to the Investigators.

22 GeForce Experience

23 6. Paragraph 105 of the FAC states: *"FE 5 confirmed that the GeForce Experience*  
24 *software informed NVIDIA about how GeForce GPUs were being used, including when they*  
25 *were being used for mining."* This statement is false. I did not and could not have told the  
26 Investigators that GeForce Experience ("GFE") data informed NVIDIA when GPUs were being  
27 used for mining. I wasn't responsible for analyzing GFE data, but I knew from my time at  
28 NVIDIA that GFE is optional software, related only to gaming. GFE provides information about  
how gamers who opt-in to GFE are using their GeForce cards. But I've never heard of GFE



1 being used for mining in any way.

2 7. Paragraph 105 of the FAC also states: ***“FE 5 stated that NVIDIA knew the***  
 3 ***percentage of GeForce GPU sales going to miners by examining the GeForce Experience***  
 4 ***data.”*** This statement is also false. I didn’t say that to the Investigators. I don’t see how  
 5 NVIDIA could have known the percentage of sales going to miners from examining GFE data.  
 6 As I said above, GFE is optional software that provides data about gaming in the field.

7 8. Paragraph 106 of the FAC states: ***“FE 5 stated that the usage data contained in***  
 8 ***these reports showed that over 60% of GeForce GPU sales during the Class Period were to***  
 9 ***miners.”*** This statement is false. I never said that to the Investigators. The statement doesn’t  
 10 make sense to me. I don’t know of any GFE reports that could show that any percentage of sales  
 11 were to miners.

12 Meeting with Mr. Huang

13 9. Paragraph 37 of the FAC states: ***“FE 5 . . . presented GeForce sales data to***  
 14 ***Huang personally during one of Huang’s multiple visits to India.”*** This statement is false. I  
 15 attended a meeting with Mr. Huang in 2015 and presented marketing strategies for the India  
 16 market. But I never presented any GeForce sales data to Mr. Huang.

17 10. Paragraph 91 of the FAC states: ***“FE 5 recalled personally presenting sales data***  
 18 ***to Huang at a meeting in 2017, attended by approximately ten others.”*** This statement is also  
 19 false. I didn’t say that to the Investigators. I didn’t meet with Mr. Huang in 2017. I told them I  
 20 had met with Mr. Huang only one time, that the meeting took place in ***2015***, and that I presented  
 21 marketing strategy for the India market. I told the Investigators that cryptocurrency was not a  
 22 topic of discussion at my meeting with Mr. Huang. I never met with Mr. Huang in 2017 or any  
 23 time after the 2015 meeting.

24 Sell-in/Sell-out Data

25 11. Paragraph 82 of the FAC states: ***“[S]ell-in/sell-out” data recorded sales***  
 26 ***throughout the distribution chain and allowed NVIDIA to determine the percentage of***  
 27 ***GeForce GPUs sold to crypto-miners.”*** This statement is false. I didn’t say that to the  
 28 Investigators, and that’s not what sell-in / sell-out data is. Sell-in / sell-out data refers only to  
 NVIDIA’s partners/distributors. It doesn’t say anything about the end user, so it could not have

1 told NVIDIA the percentage of GPUs going to crypto miners. I never would have said such a  
2 thing.

3 12. Other statements attributed to me in the FAC are also inaccurate and presented  
4 misleadingly, but the statements identified above are the key statements.

5 13. Plaintiffs never provided me a copy of the FAC or allowed me to read and review  
6 for accuracy the statements attributed to me. If they had, I would have corrected them.

7 14. I am disappointed that my statements have been mischaracterized in the FAC. I  
8 am concerned that by putting such untrue statements in the FAC and clearly attributing them to  
9 me, as many in the local India market will understand—without even giving me a chance to  
10 correct them—Plaintiffs will damage my reputation in the industry. The attorneys from NVIDIA  
11 and from Cooley assured me that I did nothing wrong, and that I have a right to clarify the record  
12 if I wish. They asked only for the truth and assured me that even if I chose to say nothing  
13 further, NVIDIA would respect my privacy and not retaliate in any way.

14  
15 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that foregoing is  
16 true and correct. Executed this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June 2020, in Bengaluru, Karnataka, India.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

